

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP

Attorneys At Law

225 West Santa Clara Street, Suite 1200
San Jose, CA 95113-1723

Tel. 408.292.5600
Fax 408.287.8040

www.thelenreid.com

F A X C O V E R P A G E

Date: July 9, 2004

Total Pages: 4
(including cover)

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 09 2004

To: U.S. Patent & Trademark Office **Fax:** 703.872.9306
Phone:

OFFICIAL

From: Marc S. Hanish

Fax: 408.278.8204
Phone: 408.282.1804
E-Mail: mhanish@thelenreid.com

V I A F A X O N L Y

Re: U.S. Serial No. 09/477,021

Please see following Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

In case of a problem with this transmission, please call the Fax Operator at 408.282.1866

JOB #	ATTORNEY #	CLIENT-MATTER	RETURN TO	ROOM #
	40540	032590/78		

IMPORTANT: This fax transmission is intended only for the addressee. It contains information from the law firm of Thelen Reid & Priest LLP which may be privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Dissemination, distribution, or copying of this by anyone other than the addressee or the addressee's agent is strictly prohibited. If this transmission is received in error, please notify Thelen Reid & Priest LLP immediately at the telephone number indicated above. We will reimburse your costs incurred in connection with this erroneous transmission and your return of these materials. THANK YOU.

Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office

on July 9, 2004.

Date



Signature

Sharon E. Byam

Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of transmission, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

U.S. Serial No. 09/477,021

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form (w/attachment)

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.8. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 1.8 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 09/477,021 First Named Applicant: Chandrupatla
 Examiner: Nguyen, Chau Art Unit: 2176 Status of Application: Pending

Tentative Participants:

(1) Chau Nguyen, Examiner (2) Joseph Feild, Examiner

(3) Marc S. Hanish, (4) _____
 Reg. No. 42,626

Proposed Date of Interview: _____ Proposed Time: _____ (AM/PM)

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☐ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rej.</u>	<u>1-66</u>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☐ Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

See attached page. Please contact Applicant to arrange for
interview time at Examiner's convenience.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE:

This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

U.S. Serial No. 09/477,021

CISCO-1340

Applicant feels that the Final Office Action does not provide a proper basis for the obviousness rejection. Specifically, Applicant pointed out in the last response that it was unclear whether the Patent Office was alleging that the element "a central database of all NASes" was contained in the Chuah reference or the Holt reference. The Final Office Action states that "it is not necessary to have only one reference including 'a central database of all NASes', either Chuah et al. reference or Holt et al. reference teaches 'a central database of all NASes' or maybe both do teach 'a central database of all NASes'."

Applicant feels that the Patent Office has misconstrued the last response. Applicant agrees that it is perfectly appropriate to have an obviousness rejection wherein two references are combined in a certain way to teach a single element, as opposed to the single element being taught in one of the references or another. However, no matter what the basis is for the rejection, Applicant maintains that it is necessary for the Patent Office to specify the basis. If the Patent Office feels the element is taught by Chuah alone, then it must say as much. If the Patent Office feels that the element is taught by Holt alone, then it must say as much. If the Patent Office feels that certain elements of Chuah can be combined with certain elements with Holt to teach the element, then it must say as much and point out those elements of each.

It appears clear from the Final Office Action that the Patent Office is unsure whether Holt alone or Chuah alone teach the element, or whether the references must be combined to teach the element (see the "maybe" language in the above quote). If the Patent Office does not know, then the Applicant clearly cannot know. Since the Applicant cannot know, it becomes impossible to respond to the rejection, as the rejection has not properly been defined.

In short, Applicant feels that the Patent Office is required to commit to a basis for the rejection and to express that basis in a clear manner. In this case, Applicant respectfully maintains that the Patent Office has merely handwaved and stated generally that somewhere in Chuah or Holt or both together the element exists, and it is up to the Applicant to figure out where. Applicant feels this is inappropriate and is requesting appropriate correction.